

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065  
rvannest@kvn.com  
3 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325  
canderson@kvn.com  
4 633 Battery Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415.391.5400  
Facsimile: 415.397.7188

5 KING & SPALDING LLP  
6 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
7 ROBERT F. PERRY  
rerry@kslaw.com  
8 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
9 New York, NY 10036  
Tel: 212.556.2100  
10 Fax: 212.556.2222

11 Attorneys for Defendant  
12 GOOGLE INC.

13 KING & SPALDING LLP  
14 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
fzimmer@kslaw.com  
15 CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
csabnis@kslaw.com  
16 101 Second St., Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.318.1200  
Fax: 415.318.1300

17 IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
ballon@gtlaw.com  
18 HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
meekerh@gtlaw.com  
19 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1900 University Avenue  
East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Tel: 650.328.8500  
Fax: 650.328-8508

20

21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
22 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
23 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

24 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

25 Plaintiff,

26 v.

27 GOOGLE INC.,

28 Defendant.

Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

**GOOGLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5  
TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OBTAINED  
FROM MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.**

Judge: Hon. William Alsup

Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010

Trial Date: October 31, 2011

## **MOTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED**

Under Patent Local Rule 3-1 and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 37, defendant Google, Inc. (“Google”) hereby moves the Court for an order excluding *in limine* from all phases of this trial the documents and testimony<sup>1</sup> of, and all evidence and argument relating to, Motorola Mobility, Inc. (“Motorola Mobility”). Those documents and testimony, and related argument, are expected to be presented as evidence of alleged infringement that was not disclosed in Oracle’s Infringement Contentions (“ICs”), was not addressed in Oracle’s expert reports regarding alleged infringement,<sup>2</sup> and was not timely requested in discovery by Oracle. Oracle failed to timely discover the Motorola Mobility documents and testimony, has not asked for leave of the Court to amend its ICs, and should not be allowed to submarine Google by presenting this untimely evidence of Motorola Mobility products and activities.

## DISCUSSION

13 Oracle’s original complaint accused Google of indirect infringement based on the  
14 activities of “purchasers, licensees, and users of Android.” (Dkt. 1 at ¶¶ 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, 33,  
15 36.) As Oracle’s counsel acknowledged before the Court on February 9, 2011, “Google  
16 expressed a concern that [Oracle] had not articulated sufficiently the basis for [Oracle’s] belief  
17 that the [] Android code that is on the Google public Android website is, in fact, the code that is  
18 present on the handsets that would represent the direct infringement in cases of indirect  
19 infringement.” Feb. 9, 2011 Hrg. Tr. (attached as Ex. 35 to the Declaration of Daniel Purcell in  
20 Support of Google Inc.’s Motions *in Limine* (“Purcell Decl.”) filed herewith) at 4:16–21. Yet,  
21 Oracle chose not to seek discovery from Motorola Mobility until April, which was more than  
22 halfway through the eight month discovery period and after Oracle locked in its ICs. Further,  
23 Oracle’s infringement expert, Dr. John Mitchell, did not consider or rely upon any of the

<sup>24</sup>

<sup>25</sup> <sup>1</sup> The “documents and testimony” of Motorola Mobility consist of documents labeled MOTO-ORACLE-0001 through MOTO-ORACLE-0088, which were produced pursuant to a Rule 45 subpoena, and deposition testimony Rafael Camargo taken on September 8, 2011 pursuant to a Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena.

<sup>26</sup>

<sup>27</sup> While Motorola Mobility's documents and testimony were not addressed in the Mitchell Report, the Motorola Atrix product was identified in the Mitchell Report at paragraph 191 with reference to an unrelated analysis by Dr. Mitchell. Paragraph 191 is addressed by Google's pending motion to strike on many of the same grounds presented here. (Dkt. 410 at 5.)  
<sup>28</sup>

1 documents and testimony of Motorola Mobility at issue in this motion.

2 Oracle was required to disclose explicit factual bases for its infringement theories in its  
 3 ICs, which were first served in December of 2010. Moreover, Oracle represented to this Court  
 4 that it would rely on its ICs as they existed in early April. Purcell Decl. Ex. 36, (Apr. 6, 2011  
 5 Hrg. Tr.) at 10:17–11:4. Those ICs identified—but did not provide an infringement analysis  
 6 of—a single Motorola Mobility product, the Motorola Droid. Purcell Decl. Ex. 37, (Oracle’s  
 7 ICs) at § I.B. Only after the hearing where Oracle accepted the consequences of relying on its  
 8 existing contentions, and five months into an eight month discovery process, Oracle issued a  
 9 subpoena to Motorola Mobility requesting documents on *fifteen* additional Android products.  
 10 Purcell Decl. Ex. 38, (Notice of Subpoena). That subpoena for documents was followed months  
 11 later by a Rule 30(b)(6) subpoena regarding the same list of products. Purcell Decl. Ex. 39,  
 12 (Rule 30(b)(6) Subpoena of Motorola Mobility, Inc.).

13 As discussed in Google’s Motion to Strike Portions of the Mitchell Patent Report,  
 14 Oracle’s evidence of alleged direct infringement should be limited to the specific products  
 15 accused in the ICs, which identify a single Motorola product, the Droid. (Dkt. 410 at 5.)  
 16 Oracle’s plan has been to identify “representative examples” of allegedly infringing products  
 17 while seeking damages for the entire universe of Android devices. Purcell Decl. Ex. 37,  
 18 (Oracle’s ICs) at § I.B. While some courts have held that a party may rely on representative  
 19 products in ICs to seek discovery on similar products (*see, e.g., Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Acer*  
 20 *America Corp.*, 655 F. Supp. 2d 650 (E.D. Tex. 2009)), the Patent Local Rules require specific  
 21 identification of allegedly infringing products. A party must show “good cause” to amend its  
 22 contentions to identify newly accused products. *See generally LG Elecs., Inc. v. Q-Lity*  
 23 *Computer, Inc.*, 211 F.R.D. 360 (N.D. Cal., 2002); *Atmel Corp. v. AuthenTec, Inc.*, No. 06-2138,  
 24 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10846 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 31, 2008). Here, fact discovery closed without  
 25 Oracle ever seeking leave to amend its contentions to add the additional fifteen Motorola  
 26 Mobility products, including the Atrix 4G, Cliq, Cliq 2, Droid 2, Droid Pro, Droid X, Bravo,  
 27 Flipside, Citrus, Defy, Charm, Backflip, Devour, Xoom, and i1.

28 As explained in Google’s recently filed motion to strike, Patent Local Rule 3-1 requires,

1 in relevant part, that infringement contentions provide:

2           (b) Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus,  
 3 product, device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality  
 4 (“Accused Instrumentality”) of each opposing party of which the  
 5 party is aware. *This identification shall be as specific as possible.*  
*Each product, device, and apparatus shall be identified by name*  
*or model number, if known.* Each method or process shall be  
 6 identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or  
 7 apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the  
 8 claimed method or process;

9           ...

10           (d) *For each claim which is alleged to have been indirectly*  
*infringed, an identification of any direct infringement and a*  
*description of the acts of the alleged indirect infringer that*  
*contribute to or are inducing that direct infringement.* Insofar as  
 11 alleged direct infringement is based on joint acts of multiple  
 12 parties, the role of each such party in the direct infringement must  
 13 be described.

14           ...

15 (Emphasis added.) According to these rules, products accused of direct or indirect infringement  
 16 must be explicitly identified in a plaintiff’s infringement contentions. Oracle’s generalized  
 17 assertions of infringement by “Google devices running Android” or “other mobile devices  
 18 running Android” are insufficient under the Patent Local Rules to extend Oracle’s infringement  
 19 allegations to cover unidentified products, as are attempts to suggest that the identified products  
 20 are merely “representative.” *See Bender v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.*, No. 09-1149 MMC,  
 21 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11539 at \*3 (N.D. Cal. February 1, 2010) (“even if [the plaintiff] can  
 22 establish that it is appropriate to use representative claim charts, he has not in all instances  
 23 adequately identified the accused products at issue. Pursuant to Rule 3-1(b), the patentee’s  
 24 identification of which accused products allegedly infringe cannot be so amorphous or imprecise  
 25 so as to force the opposing party to essentially ‘guess which versions of its products’ are  
 26 allegedly infringing. *InterTrust Techs. Corp. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. C 01-1640 SBA, 2003 U.S.  
 27 Dist. LEXIS 22736, at \*6 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2003”); *Bender v. Maxim Integrated Products,*  
 28 *Inc.*, ,No. 09-01152 (SI), 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89957 at \*9 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2010)  
 (“plaintiff must identify each accused product and link it to a representative product [claim chart]  
 in order to provide [the defendant] with fair notice of the specific products which are accused in  
 this lawsuit.”).

1       Nearly six months ago, Oracle had identified fifteen specific publically available Android  
2 products offered by Motorola Mobility, but chose not to amend its ICs to identify or analyze its  
3 infringement contentions against those products. Oracle cannot now, on the eve of trial,  
4 introduce evidence of alleged direct infringement by these products.

5       Nor should Oracle's infringement expert, Dr. Mitchell, be allowed to present any  
6 opinions on the documents and testimony of Motorola Mobility as that material was not  
7 considered in his infringement reports. Purcell Decl. Ex. 40 (Second Supplemental List of  
8 Materials Considered). Under Rule 26(a)(2)(B)(ii) and 26(e)(2), Dr. Mitchell was required to  
9 identify all of "the facts or data considered . . . in forming [his opinions]." Rule 37(c)(1)  
10 prevents Dr. Mitchell from opining on that material.

11       Accordingly, the Court should exclude the documents and testimony of, and all evidence  
12 and argument relating to, Motorola Mobility including documents labeled MOTO-ORACLE-  
13 0001 through MOTO-ORACLE-0088 and the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition testimony of Rafael  
14 Camargo taken on September 8, 2011.

15

16

Respectfully submitted,

17

18

Dated: September 24, 2011

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

19

20

By: s/ Robert A. Van Nest

21

ROBERT A. VAN NEST  
Attorneys for Defendant  
GOOGLE INC.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28